

**From:** Shoven, Heather

**Required Attendees:** Rita Bair; Poy, Thomas; Damato, Nicholas; Deltoral, Miguel;  
King, Carol; Glowacki, Joanna; Crooks, Jennifer

**Location:** Room 1515B or Call-in Non Responsive with Conference Code Non Responsive

**Importance:** High

**Subject:** Flint Discussion

**Start Date/Time:** Mon 9/21/2015 1:30:00 PM

**End Date/Time:** Mon 9/21/2015 2:30:00 PM

[Flint LCR for FOIA 6429-15 \(5\).pdf](#)

[FOIA 15-585 Part 2 55pgs \(12\).pdf](#)

Would like to discuss email from Marc Edwards forwarded below -

**From:** Rosenthal, Adam (DEQ)  
**Sent:** Friday, July 10, 2015 11:28 AM  
**To:** 'Michael Glasgow'  
**Cc:** Brent Wright  
**Subject:** RE: lead/copper

we are discussing options regarding this and future rounds of monitoring and will get back with you.

thanks,

Adam Rosenthal, EQA  
MDEQ – Office of Drinking Water and Municipal Assistance  
Lansing District – Constitution Hall 1SW  
PO Box 30242  
Lansing, MI 48909  
517-284-6644  
fax: 517-241-3571

For MORs, Lab Results & Reporting Forms:  
[DEQ-DWMA-Lansing@michigan.gov](mailto:DEQ-DWMA-Lansing@michigan.gov)

**From:** Michael Glasgow [<mailto:mglasgow@cityofflint.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 09, 2015 2:19 PM  
**To:** Rosenthal, Adam (DEQ)  
**Cc:** Brent Wright  
**Subject:** Re: lead/copper

Adam,

I just sent the last of the samples to the lab today. Unfortunately we did not reach 100 samples. I believe the count I have is 76 total. Since we have had a few more hits this round, we are going to continue to solicit samples for our own informational purposes. I am disappointed in the turnout of sampling, we distributed close to 200 sample bottles. With this monitoring violation will we be required to collect another round of 100 samples?

**From:** Marc Edwards [<mailto:edwardsm@vt.edu>]

**Sent:** Sunday, September 20, 2015 9:30 PM

**To:** Schock, Michael; Lytle, Darren; [kempic.jeffrey@epa.gov](mailto:kempic.jeffrey@epa.gov); Burneson, Eric; [demarco.carol@epa.gov](mailto:demarco.carol@epa.gov); Murphy, Thomas; Shoven, Heather; Deltoral, Miguel

**Subject:** Flint MI: LCR Enforcement Issues

Mike, Darren, Jeff, Eric, Carol and Miguel and R5 MI/Enforcement personnel (as listed on the R5 webpage).

In this e-mail, I am making you aware of what we know regarding the Flint lead situation.

1) They do not have an approved lead sampling pool. Only 13 of the lowest lead sampled homes from 2014, were resampled in 2015.

The homes sampling high in 2014, were not asked to be resampled.

At best, their program is sending out sampling bottles at random across the city.

2) This message exemplifies the type of site selection, that they are doing to satisfy their high risk LCR monitoring pool site.

That is, none. They are not even hiding it.

<http://www.flintneighborhoodsunited.org/drinking-water-testing/>.

3) Furthermore, in a video now on the ACLU website, at the end of the interview, Mike Glasgow (Flint LCR program) notes what is perfectly obvious from looking at the MDEQ FOIA materials.

***“we threw out bottles everywhere just to collect as many as we can, just to hit our number, and we just turn in every result we get in.”***

Moreover, they do not have the records to show the homes have lead pipe. ***“we are still looking for the records”***

See video here. Start at 4 minutes and 13 seconds to see the admission.

<https://vimeo.com/139882021>

4) On top of that, according to my count, MDEQ covered up no fewer than 5 violations in the 2015 sample round. These include:

a) Technical violation in that what they now stamp as the “draft” report (attached) is late (the signed date is 7/28/2015).

It was due 7/10/2015. The final “revised” report is dated 8/20/2015 (also attached), which is 40 days late.

b) Although 87 sites from 2014 were not resampled, no written justification for the site changes was provided in the FOIA materials, and this is required by law.

The statement given today by Flint, that residents were not resampled because they did not want to participate, is contradicted by my conversations with residents.

c) In the original 71 samples Flint submitted late, the lead 90%ile action level was exceeded. MDEQ took the initiative to invalidate 2 samples, dropping Flint below the Action Level.

Flint never requested in writing that any of the samples be invalidated (see the comments written in the box of page 1, FOIA 15-585).

Mike Glasgow says that the 2 high samples were deleted based on the conference call. Only the high samples were scrutinized for meeting the sample pool criteria.

No low samples were investigated. I have the e-mails.

4) The "Draft 7/28/2015" and "revised 8/20/2015" LCR reports, on page 1, check boxes that note Tier 1 sites are not used. MDEQ asks no questions about that. In video Mike admits he has no knowledge of what sites actually have lead pipe or not.

5) Flint did not achieve the minimum number of samples as determined before the sampling round. In his e-mail Mike Glasgow (see below, and see FLINT LCR FOR FOIA...pdf) acknowledges this will be a technical violation. The draft LCR clearly indicates that the minimum was not achieved. MDEQ responds "we are discussing options" to handle this technical violation. In the August 20<sup>th</sup> revised final report, even this technical violation magically disappears (see comments box on page 1....).

### KEY POINTS:

1) FLINT HAS LOTS OF LEAD PIPE, NO CORROSION CONTROL TREATMENT, AND HAS HAD NO LEGITIMATE LCR TESTING FOR AT LEAST A YEAR.

2) AMONGST LOW INCOME INFANTS, BREAST FEEDING RATES ARE LOWER, AND FORMULA USE IS HIGHER. MANY FLINTS RESIDENTS CANNOT AFFORD TO FLUSH DUE TO HIGH WATER RATES. THEY CANNOT AFFORD BOTTLED WATER. THIS IS AN UNPRECEDENTED SITUATION AND EPA NEEDS TO TAKE THIS SERIOUSLY. NOW.

3) WE HAVE ONE CHILD WITH ELEVATED BLOOD LEAD ALREADY...IN FACT, THAT IS THE ONLY REASON WE KNOW ABOUT ANY OF THE ABOVE.

4) MDEQ IS STILL PUBLICLY INSISTING FLINT WATER HAS TESTED SAFE, IS SAFE, AND THAT FLINT HAS **NO VIOLATIONS** of any sort.

I believe that someone at HQ or in R5 should immediately take decisive action on this issue to protect the public.

Marc